

## New Income Tax

We have prepared an analysis of the New Income Tax Law. This analysis contains tables and charts and shows graphically the operation of the law. Copies sent investors upon request.

Ask for Income Tax Booklet B-33

**Harris, Forbes & Co**  
Pine St., Cor. William  
NEW YORK

### NOTICE OF REDEMPTION.

To holders of Victory notes and others concerned:

Note is hereby given as follows:

1—Call for redemption of 3% per cent Victory notes—All of the 3% per cent series of United States of America convertible Gold Notes of 1922-1923, otherwise known as 3% Per cent Victory Notes, which had been called for redemption on June 15, 1922, pursuant to the provision for redemption contained in the Notes and in Treasury Department circular number 188, dated January 15, 1919, under which notes were originally issued. Interest on all Victory notes of the 3% per cent series will cease on said redemption date, June 15, 1922.

Redemption and Termination of Victory note conversion privilege.—In view of the call for the redemption of all 3% per cent Victory notes on June 15, 1922, and pursuant to the provisions of said Treasury Department circular number 188, notice is hereby given that conversion of Victory notes of either series into Victory notes of the other series is hereby suspended from February 15, 1922, to June 15, 1922, both inclusive. Victory notes, according to the terms of the 3% per cent series will cease to be convertible effective February 15, 1922, and on and after that date no conversion will be made.

3—Debt obligations—Under the presentation of the notes for payment of Victory notes, or for payment of interest on the same, to the Bureau of the Budget, or to the Comptroller of the Treasury, or to the Director of Finance, or to the Director of the Federal Reserve Banks.

A. W. MELLON,  
Secretary of the Treasury, Feb. 8, 1922.

### PROPOSALS.

PUBLIC NOTICE.  
Public notice is hereby given that sealed proposals for the erection of the Casino Building located in Ocean Park, corner Ocean Aves. and Broadwater, will be received by the Board of Commissioners of the City of Long Beach at City Hall, Main Chamber, Tuesday evening, March 21st, 1922, at 8 o'clock, and as soon thereafter as the matter may require.

The successful bidder will be required to pay water, sewer, light and ordinary upkeep expenses.

Separate bids shall be made for each term (one, two or five years), but same party may bid on all three terms; rents to be paid in advance, half yearly, including interest, and one-half on the first day of June in each year, and where the term is either three or five years one-half the yearly rents shall be paid in advance of the signing of the agreement. No bid will be considered unless accompanied by a certified check in amount equivalent to one-half of the amount bid, drawn to the order of Frank D. Howland, Treasurer, or cash in equal amount, for a term of over one year, security will be required.

The Board of Commissioners reserves the right to reject any or all bids if it deems fit to do so, and to accept the best bid to do so.

All bids must be sealed, marked "Bids for rental of Casino Bldg." and addressed to Peter F. Lawyer, City Clerk.

Dated, Long Beach, N. J., February 24, 1922.

ELMER F. LAWYER, City Clerk.

CIRCULAR NO. 544—Sealed proposals will be received at Office of General Purchasing Agent, Alaskan Engineering Commission, Room 422, Bell Street Terminal, Seattle, Wash., between 11 A. M. and 1 P. M., May 1, 1922, for furnishing, and erecting in Alaska, of one Steel Bridge over Tanana River, Mile 417, between Fairbanks and Nome. Copies of this Circular may be obtained upon application at this office, or from Alaskan Engineering Commission, 201½ 5th Avenue, Portland, Oregon; Alaskan Engineering Commission, San Francisco, Calif.; 102 Custom House, San Francisco, Calif.; and Pacific Coast Superintendent of Warehouses, Indian Service, 390 So. Ashland Ave., Chicago, Ill.; Bureau of Public Roads, Washington, D. C.; Alaskan Engineering Commission, Department of the Interior, Washington, D. C.; and Monks & Angell, Consulting Civil Engineers, 200 Michigan Ave., Chicago, Ill.; C. E. DOLE, General Purchasing Agent.

### PRINDIVILLE LOSES ON \$450,000 APPEAL

Court Holds He Has No Right to Equity Relief.

Special Dispatch to THE NEW YORK HERALD.  
TRINITY, March 6.—The Court of Errors and Appeals to-day sustained the action of Vice-Chancellor Backes in dismissing a suit by which Thomas J. Prindiville sought to compel Johnson & Higgins, a corporation, to distribute dividends and to restrain the payment of excessive salaries to officers of the corporation.

Prior to 1829, Johnson & Higgins, a copartnership, carried on a large insurance business in New York and elsewhere. The copartnership was then converted into a New Jersey corporation, the principal assets included in the charters which the Court of Errors held were in illegal restraint of trade, contrary to the laws of the State and prohibited by its public policy.

Mr. Prindiville became a stockholder in 1911, when he was elected an officer. Between that time and 1919, when he retired, he was in the aggregate between \$450,000 and \$500,000 in the company. Chief Justice Gummere, in his opinion, said: "If we consider him as a mere individual seeking to repudiate for his own personal advantage a fraud upon the State in which he was so long a participant, it is entirely settled that the better course is to let the company remain a considerable higher figure."

Mr. Prindiville became a stockholder in 1911, when he was elected an officer. Between that time and 1919, when he retired, he was in the aggregate between \$450,000 and \$500,000 in the company. Chief Justice Gummere, in his opinion, said: "If we consider him as a mere individual seeking to repudiate for his own personal advantage a fraud upon the State in which he was so long a participant, it is entirely settled that the better course is to let the company remain a considerable higher figure."

Mr. Prindiville, a copartnership, carried on a large insurance business in New York and elsewhere. The copartnership was then converted into a New Jersey corporation, the principal assets included in the charters which the Court of Errors held were in illegal restraint of trade, contrary to the laws of the State and prohibited by its public policy.

Mr. Prindiville became a stockholder in 1911, when he was elected an officer. Between that time and 1919, when he retired, he was in the aggregate between \$450,000 and \$500,000 in the company. Chief Justice Gummere, in his opinion, said: "If we consider him as a mere individual seeking to repudiate for his own personal advantage a fraud upon the State in which he was so long a participant, it is entirely settled that the better course is to let the company remain a considerable higher figure."

Mr. Prindiville became a stockholder in 1911, when he was elected an officer. Between that time and 1919, when he retired, he was in the aggregate between \$450,000 and \$500,000 in the company. Chief Justice Gummere, in his opinion, said: "If we consider him as a mere individual seeking to repudiate for his own personal advantage a fraud upon the State in which he was so long a participant, it is entirely settled that the better course is to let the company remain a considerable higher figure."

Mr. Prindiville became a stockholder in 1911, when he was elected an officer. Between that time and 1919, when he retired, he was in the aggregate between \$450,000 and \$500,000 in the company. Chief Justice Gummere, in his opinion, said: "If we consider him as a mere individual seeking to repudiate for his own personal advantage a fraud upon the State in which he was so long a participant, it is entirely settled that the better course is to let the company remain a considerable higher figure."

Mr. Prindiville became a stockholder in 1911, when he was elected an officer. Between that time and 1919, when he retired, he was in the aggregate between \$450,000 and \$500,000 in the company. Chief Justice Gummere, in his opinion, said: "If we consider him as a mere individual seeking to repudiate for his own personal advantage a fraud upon the State in which he was so long a participant, it is entirely settled that the better course is to let the company remain a considerable higher figure."

Mr. Prindiville became a stockholder in 1911, when he was elected an officer. Between that time and 1919, when he retired, he was in the aggregate between \$450,000 and \$500,000 in the company. Chief Justice Gummere, in his opinion, said: "If we consider him as a mere individual seeking to repudiate for his own personal advantage a fraud upon the State in which he was so long a participant, it is entirely settled that the better course is to let the company remain a considerable higher figure."

Mr. Prindiville became a stockholder in 1911, when he was elected an officer. Between that time and 1919, when he retired, he was in the aggregate between \$450,000 and \$500,000 in the company. Chief Justice Gummere, in his opinion, said: "If we consider him as a mere individual seeking to repudiate for his own personal advantage a fraud upon the State in which he was so long a participant, it is entirely settled that the better course is to let the company remain a considerable higher figure."

Mr. Prindiville became a stockholder in 1911, when he was elected an officer. Between that time and 1919, when he retired, he was in the aggregate between \$450,000 and \$500,000 in the company. Chief Justice Gummere, in his opinion, said: "If we consider him as a mere individual seeking to repudiate for his own personal advantage a fraud upon the State in which he was so long a participant, it is entirely settled that the better course is to let the company remain a considerable higher figure."

Mr. Prindiville became a stockholder in 1911, when he was elected an officer. Between that time and 1919, when he retired, he was in the aggregate between \$450,000 and \$500,000 in the company. Chief Justice Gummere, in his opinion, said: "If we consider him as a mere individual seeking to repudiate for his own personal advantage a fraud upon the State in which he was so long a participant, it is entirely settled that the better course is to let the company remain a considerable higher figure."

Mr. Prindiville became a stockholder in 1911, when he was elected an officer. Between that time and 1919, when he retired, he was in the aggregate between \$450,000 and \$500,000 in the company. Chief Justice Gummere, in his opinion, said: "If we consider him as a mere individual seeking to repudiate for his own personal advantage a fraud upon the State in which he was so long a participant, it is entirely settled that the better course is to let the company remain a considerable higher figure."

Mr. Prindiville became a stockholder in 1911, when he was elected an officer. Between that time and 1919, when he retired, he was in the aggregate between \$450,000 and \$500,000 in the company. Chief Justice Gummere, in his opinion, said: "If we consider him as a mere individual seeking to repudiate for his own personal advantage a fraud upon the State in which he was so long a participant, it is entirely settled that the better course is to let the company remain a considerable higher figure."

Mr. Prindiville became a stockholder in 1911, when he was elected an officer. Between that time and 1919, when he retired, he was in the aggregate between \$450,000 and \$500,000 in the company. Chief Justice Gummere, in his opinion, said: "If we consider him as a mere individual seeking to repudiate for his own personal advantage a fraud upon the State in which he was so long a participant, it is entirely settled that the better course is to let the company remain a considerable higher figure."

Mr. Prindiville became a stockholder in 1911, when he was elected an officer. Between that time and 1919, when he retired, he was in the aggregate between \$450,000 and \$500,000 in the company. Chief Justice Gummere, in his opinion, said: "If we consider him as a mere individual seeking to repudiate for his own personal advantage a fraud upon the State in which he was so long a participant, it is entirely settled that the better course is to let the company remain a considerable higher figure."

Mr. Prindiville became a stockholder in 1911, when he was elected an officer. Between that time and 1919, when he retired, he was in the aggregate between \$450,000 and \$500,000 in the company. Chief Justice Gummere, in his opinion, said: "If we consider him as a mere individual seeking to repudiate for his own personal advantage a fraud upon the State in which he was so long a participant, it is entirely settled that the better course is to let the company remain a considerable higher figure."

Mr. Prindiville became a stockholder in 1911, when he was elected an officer. Between that time and 1919, when he retired, he was in the aggregate between \$450,000 and \$500,000 in the company. Chief Justice Gummere, in his opinion, said: "If we consider him as a mere individual seeking to repudiate for his own personal advantage a fraud upon the State in which he was so long a participant, it is entirely settled that the better course is to let the company remain a considerable higher figure."

Mr. Prindiville became a stockholder in 1911, when he was elected an officer. Between that time and 1919, when he retired, he was in the aggregate between \$450,000 and \$500,000 in the company. Chief Justice Gummere, in his opinion, said: "If we consider him as a mere individual seeking to repudiate for his own personal advantage a fraud upon the State in which he was so long a participant, it is entirely settled that the better course is to let the company remain a considerable higher figure."

Mr. Prindiville became a stockholder in 1911, when he was elected an officer. Between that time and 1919, when he retired, he was in the aggregate between \$450,000 and \$500,000 in the company. Chief Justice Gummere, in his opinion, said: "If we consider him as a mere individual seeking to repudiate for his own personal advantage a fraud upon the State in which he was so long a participant, it is entirely settled that the better course is to let the company remain a considerable higher figure."

Mr. Prindiville became a stockholder in 1911, when he was elected an officer. Between that time and 1919, when he retired, he was in the aggregate between \$450,000 and \$500,000 in the company. Chief Justice Gummere, in his opinion, said: "If we consider him as a mere individual seeking to repudiate for his own personal advantage a fraud upon the State in which he was so long a participant, it is entirely settled that the better course is to let the company remain a considerable higher figure."

Mr. Prindiville became a stockholder in 1911, when he was elected an officer. Between that time and 1919, when he retired, he was in the aggregate between \$450,000 and \$500,000 in the company. Chief Justice Gummere, in his opinion, said: "If we consider him as a mere individual seeking to repudiate for his own personal advantage a fraud upon the State in which he was so long a participant, it is entirely settled that the better course is to let the company remain a considerable higher figure."

Mr. Prindiville became a stockholder in 1911, when he was elected an officer. Between that time and 1919, when he retired, he was in the aggregate between \$450,000 and \$500,000 in the company. Chief Justice Gummere, in his opinion, said: "If we consider him as a mere individual seeking to repudiate for his own personal advantage a fraud upon the State in which he was so long a participant, it is entirely settled that the better course is to let the company remain a considerable higher figure."

Mr. Prindiville became a stockholder in 1911, when he was elected an officer. Between that time and 1919, when he retired, he was in the aggregate between \$450,000 and \$500,000 in the company. Chief Justice Gummere, in his opinion, said: "If we consider him as a mere individual seeking to repudiate for his own personal advantage a fraud upon the State in which he was so long a participant, it is entirely settled that the better course is to let the company remain a considerable higher figure."

Mr. Prindiville became a stockholder in 1911, when he was elected an officer. Between that time and 1919, when he retired, he was in the aggregate between \$450,000 and \$500,000 in the company. Chief Justice Gummere, in his opinion, said: "If we consider him as a mere individual seeking to repudiate for his own personal advantage a fraud upon the State in which he was so long a participant, it is entirely settled that the better course is to let the company remain a considerable higher figure."

Mr. Prindiville became a stockholder in 1911, when he was elected an officer. Between that time and 1919, when he retired, he was in the aggregate between \$450,000 and \$500,000 in the company. Chief Justice Gummere, in his opinion, said: "If we consider him as a mere individual seeking to repudiate for his own personal advantage a fraud upon the State in which he was so long a participant, it is entirely settled that the better course is to let the company remain a considerable higher figure."

Mr. Prindiville became a stockholder in 1911, when he was elected an officer. Between that time and 1919, when he retired, he was in the aggregate between \$450,000 and \$500,000 in the company. Chief Justice Gummere, in his opinion, said: "If we consider him as a mere individual seeking to repudiate for his own personal advantage a fraud upon the State in which he was so long a participant, it is entirely settled that the better course is to let the company remain a considerable higher figure."

Mr. Prindiville became a stockholder in 1911, when he was elected an officer. Between that time and 1919, when he retired, he was in the aggregate between \$450,000 and \$500,000 in the company. Chief Justice Gummere, in his opinion, said: "If we consider him as a mere individual seeking to repudiate for his own personal advantage a fraud upon the State in which he was so long a participant, it is entirely settled that the better course is to let the company remain a considerable higher figure."

Mr. Prindiville became a stockholder in 1911, when he was elected an officer. Between that time and 1919, when he retired, he was in the aggregate between \$450,000 and \$500,000 in the company. Chief Justice Gummere, in his opinion, said: "If we consider him as a mere individual seeking to repudiate for his own personal advantage a fraud upon the State in which he was so long a participant, it is entirely settled that the better course is to let the company remain a considerable higher figure."

Mr. Prindiville became a stockholder in 1911, when he was elected an officer. Between that time and 1919, when he retired, he was in the aggregate between \$450,000 and \$500,000 in the company. Chief Justice Gummere, in his opinion, said: "If we consider him as a mere individual seeking to repudiate for his own personal advantage a fraud upon the State in which he was so long a participant, it is entirely settled that the better course is to let the company remain a considerable higher figure."

Mr. Prindiville became a stockholder in 1911, when he was elected an officer. Between that time and 1919, when he retired, he was in the aggregate between \$450,000 and \$500,000 in the company. Chief Justice Gummere, in his opinion, said: "If we consider him as a mere individual seeking to repudiate for his own personal advantage a fraud upon the State in which he was so long a participant, it is entirely settled that the better course is to let the company remain a considerable higher figure."

Mr. Prindiville became a stockholder in 1911, when he was elected an officer. Between that time and 1919, when he retired, he was in the aggregate between \$450,000 and \$500,000 in the company. Chief Justice Gummere, in his opinion, said: "If we consider him as a mere individual seeking to repudiate for his own personal advantage a fraud upon the State in which he was so long a participant, it is entirely settled that the better course is to let the company remain a considerable higher figure."

Mr. Prindiville became a stockholder in 1911, when he was elected an officer. Between that time and 1919, when he retired, he was in the aggregate between \$450,000 and \$500,000 in the company. Chief Justice Gummere, in his opinion, said: "If we consider him as a mere individual seeking to repudiate for his own personal advantage a fraud upon the State in which he was so long a participant, it is entirely settled that the better course is to let the company remain a considerable higher figure."

Mr. Prindiville became a stockholder in 1911, when he was elected an officer. Between that time and 1919, when he retired, he was in the aggregate between \$450,000 and \$500,000 in the company. Chief Justice Gummere, in his opinion, said: "If we consider him as a mere individual seeking to repudiate for his own personal advantage a fraud upon the State in which he was so long a participant, it is entirely settled that the better course is to let the company remain a considerable higher figure."

Mr. Prindiville became a stockholder in 1911, when he was elected an officer. Between that time and 1919, when he retired, he was in the aggregate between \$450,000 and \$500,000 in the company. Chief Justice Gummere, in his opinion, said: "If we consider him as a mere individual seeking to repudiate for his own personal advantage a fraud upon the State in which he was so long a participant, it is entirely settled that the better course is to let the company remain a considerable higher figure."

Mr. Prindiville became a stockholder in 1911, when he was elected an officer. Between that time and 1919, when he retired, he was in the aggregate between \$450,000 and \$500,000 in the company. Chief Justice Gummere, in his opinion, said: "If we consider him as a mere individual seeking to repudiate for his own personal advantage a fraud upon the State in which he was so long a participant, it is entirely settled that the better course is to let the company remain a considerable higher figure."

Mr. Prindiville became a stockholder in 1911, when he was elected an officer. Between that time and 1919, when he retired